UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,901	04/27/2001	Scott R. Shell	50037.20USU1	9891

27488   7590   06/28/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/843,901</td><td>Applicant(s)
SHELL ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Matthew T. Henning</td><td>Art Unit
2131</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 April 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 April 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

This action is in response to the communication filed on 4/26/2005.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-28 have been examined.

2.   All Objections and Rejections not specifically set forth below have been withdrawn.

Title

3.   The title of the invention is acceptable.

Priority

4.   The application has been filed under Title 35 U.S.C §119, claiming priority to US

Provisional Application 60/269,737, filed February 16, 2001.

5.   The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this

application is February 16, 2001.

Information Disclosure Statement

6.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/23/2003 is in compliance

with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information

disclosure statement.

Drawings

7.   The drawings filed on 04/27/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made*

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1- 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al. (US Patent Number 6,301,484) hereinafter referred to as Rogers, and further in view of Win et al. (US Patent Number 6,161,139) hereinafter referred to as Win.

10.   Regarding claim 1, Rogers disclosed a computer-implemented method for maintaining configuration information on a mobile device (See Rogers Abstract), comprising: receiving a message including a request associated with configuration information stored on the mobile device (See Rogers Col. 5 Lines 14-36); identifying the source of the received message from data associated with the received message (See Rogers Col. 4 Lines 13-17 authentication of which Rogers fails to disclose specific details); determining at least one configuration setting within the configuration information affected by the received message (See Rogers Col. 6 Lines 45-62); and processing the request associated with the configuration information (See Rogers Col. 5 Line 34-Col. 7 Line 30) but failed to disclose associating a security role with the received message based on the identified source of the received message; comparing the associated security role of the received message with a security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting on the mobile device; and if the associated security role of the received message is in agreement with the security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting on the mobile device, processing the request associated with the configuration information.

Win teaches an authentication system in which a user is identified by a name and password (See Win Col. 6 Lines 20-24).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Win in the authentication of Rogers by providing a name and password with the configuration message in order to authenticate the message. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to authenticate the message prior to processing the request.

Win further teaches that in an authentication system, once a user is identified, a security role should be associated with the user, and this role should be used to determine whether a requested function should be executed or not (See Win Abstract), by checking whether the associated security role matches the security privileges of the request (See Win Col. 6 Lines 37-44 and Col. 16 Lines 6-54).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Win in the configuration system of Rogers by associating a role to the authenticated message based on the authentication data and verifying access to each configuration setting based on a set of privileges associated with the role. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to provide flexibility to the security of each configuration setting.

11.   Regarding claim 2, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that associating the security role with the received message comprises assigning a particular security role based on the source of the message (See the rejection of claim 1 above).

12.   Regarding claim 3, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the source of the message is identified from authentication and decryption of the received message (See the rejection of claim 1 above and Rogers Col. 4 Lines 13-17).

13. Regarding claim 4, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the information within the message includes a shared key that identifies the source of the message (See the rejection of claim 1 above; ie name and password).

14. Regarding claim 5, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that processing the request associated with the configuration information further comprises comparing the security role with another security privilege associated with a configuration service provider, the configuration service provider being responsible for managing the configuration information stored on the mobile device (See the rejection of claim 1 above and Win Col. 16 Lines 6-54 and Rogers Col. 7 Lines 21-28 wherein each feature code had its own privilege level which needed to be compared).

15. Regarding claim 6, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that if the security role is not in agreement with the other security privilege the request is not processed (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

16. Regarding claim 7, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that if the security role is in agreement with the security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting and with the other security privilege associated with the configuration service provider, the configuration service provider processes the request by accessing the configuration information (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61 and Rogers Col. 6 Line 63 – Col. 7 Line 6).

17. Regarding claim 8, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a computer readable medium having computer executable components for managing security on a mobile device (See Rogers Abstract and further it is well known that processors execute computer instructions in order to function), comprising: a stored setting having an assigned security role that identifies a

privilege that an entity attempting to access the stored setting must satisfy in order to access the stored setting (See Win Col. 16 Lines 6-54 and Table 1); a router configured to receive a configuration message over a wireless communication link, the router being further configured to identify a source of the configuration message and assign a security role to the received configuration message based on the identified source (See the rejection of claim 1 above), the router being further configured to pass the configuration message to other components of the mobile device (See Rogers Fig. 1), the configuration message including an instruction that affects a configuration setting (See Rogers Col. 5 Lines 34-36); a configuration manager configured to receive the configuration message from the router and to parse the configuration message to identify the configuration setting affected by the configuration message (See Rogers Col. 6 Lines 46-62), the configuration manager being further configured to compare the assigned security role of the configuration message to security roles assigned to configuration settings stored on the mobile device (See the rejection of claim 1 above); wherein if the configuration setting identified in the configuration message identifies the stored setting, and wherein if the assigned security role has sufficient privilege to access the stored setting, the configuration manager causes the instruction that affects the configuration setting to be processed (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

18.   Regarding claim 9, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a configuration service provider configured to manage at least one configuration setting stored on the mobile device, and wherein the processing of the instruction is performed by the configuration service provider (See Rogers Col. 6 Line 63 – Col. 7 Line 6).

19.   Regarding claim 10, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the configuration

service provider has an assigned security role that identifies a privilege that must be associated

with an instruction that affects a configuration setting which the configuration service provider

maintains (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

20.   Regarding claim 11, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the configuration

manager is further configured to determine if the instruction that affects the configuration setting

is in agreement with the security role assigned to the configuration service provider that

maintains the affected configuration setting, and if so, the configuration manager is further

configured to pass the instruction to the configuration service provider to be handled (See Rogers

Col. 6 Line 63 – Col. 7 Line 6 and Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

21.   Regarding claim 12, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the configuration

service provider determines if the instruction is in agreement with the security role assigned to

the stored setting prior to processing the instruction, and if not, terminating the processing of the

instruction (See Rogers Col. 6 Line 63 – Col. 7 Line 6 and Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

22.   Claims 13-19 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-7 above and further because it

is well known in the art that processors execute computer instructions in order to function (See

Rogers Col. 8 Line 33 – Col. 9 Line 22).

23.   Regarding claim 20, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a computer readable

medium within a mobile device, comprising: a data structure associated with a configuration

setting being associated with a software component resident on the mobile device, the

configuration service provider being responsible for managing the configuration setting (See the

rejection of claim 1 above and Win Col. 16 Lines 6-54), wherein the data structure comprises: a

first field including a security role associated with the configuration setting, the security role of

the configuration setting identifying a setting privilege which must be had in order to access the

configuration setting (See Win Table 1 Function and Administrative Privilege Levels), a second

field identifying an associated configuration service provider, the identity indicating an

associated configuration service provider requesting information stored on the mobile device

(See Win Col. 16 Lines 6-9 "Administrative Role ID"); a third field correlating a security role

based on the identity of the associated configuration service provider, the security role of the

configuration service provider identifying a provider privilege which must be had in order to .

make use of the configuration service provider (See Win Col. 16 Lines 6-9 "Administrative

Privilege").

24.   Regarding claim 21, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a configuration

message received over a wireless communication link between a source of the configuration

message and the mobile device, the configuration message including an instruction to access the

configuration setting, the instruction having an associated security role based on the source of the

configuration message (See the rejection of claim 1 above).

25.   Regarding claim 22, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a configuration

manager configured to cause the instruction to be processed if the security role of the instruction

is in agreement with the security role of the configuration setting (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

26.   Regarding claim 23, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a configuration

manager configured to cause the instruction to be processed if the security role of the instruction

is in agreement with the security role of the configuration service provider (See Win Col. 8 Lines

17-61).

27.   Regarding claim 24, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed a configuration

manager configured to invoke the configuration service provider if the security role of the

instruction is in agreement with the security role of the configuration service provider (See the

rejection of claim 1 above; ie name and password), the configuration service provider being

further configured to process the instruction if the security role of the instruction is in agreement

wit the security role of the configuration setting (See Win Col. 8 Lines 17-61).

28.   Regarding claim 25, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the first field

further comprises a policy field that identifies the configuration setting as a policy setting (See

Win Table 1 wherein it was inherent that because the settings were in the table, they were

identified as policy settings).

29.   Regarding claim 26, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the policy setting

can only be modified by an instruction generated by a particular source (See Win Table 1 which

showed that only certain sources can modify settings).

30.   Regarding claim 27, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the particular

source includes administrative privileges (See Win Table 1 Administrative Privilege Level).

31.   Regarding claim 28, the combination of Rogers and Win disclosed that the policy setting

may only be modified locally (See Win Col. 15 Paragraph 6 and Fig. 1 Element 114).

Response to Amendment

32.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

33.   Applicant argues primarily that:

      I.   Austin did not disclose all the limitations of claim 1.

II.   Win did not disclose all the limitations of claim 20.

III.   There is no suggestion to combine Austin and Rogers.

IV   Austin and Rogers do not meet all the limitations of claim 8.

V.   Austin and Win cannot be combined in the manner suggested.

VI.   Austin and Win do not meet all the limitations of claims 21-24.

34.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

35.   Claims 1-28 have been rejected.

36.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew Henning
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2131
6/20/2005

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100